Universal Relativity and Its Mathematical Requirements

Sanjay M. Wagh*
School of Mathematical Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban 4041, Republic of South Africa†
(Dated: December 8, 2005)

In this presentation, I review physical principles behind a recently proposed [1] Universal Theory of Relativity and speculate on the mathematical requirements implied by these physical principles. Some unresolved issues will also be discussed.

Presented at the South African Mathematical Society's 48th Meeting
October 31 - November 2, 2005, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa

arXiv:physics/0602038v1 [physics.gen-ph] 6 Feb 2006

Newtonian explanations of physical phenomena rest on four, *mutually logically independent*, conceptions, namely, those of inertia, force, source of the force and a law of motion. Due to the mutual logical independencies of these conceptions, these are the *assumptions or postulates* of the newtonian theoretical framework. The same logical independency of basic concepts is also behind "the equality of inertia and gravitational mass of a physical body" being an assumption of Newton's theory. Thus, newtonian theories cannot offer explanations for the inertia, the source characteristics of physical matter, the law of force and the law of motion. Within these limitations, newtonian theories still explain a large body of observations.

To explain the known experimental data, we then need to assume *four* fundamental forces, *viz*, those of gravity, electromagnetism, strong nuclear and weak nuclear interactions.

Theoretical physicists, in general, aim to "unify" these four basic forces. That is to say, the grand aim of theoretical physicists is to 'show' that these fundamental forces arise from a single, mathematical or physical, entity. This "unification of the four (fundamental) forces" is then required [1] to also provide us an "explanation" that removes the mutual logical independencies of the involved fundamental physical concepts. Evidently, this aim requires departures from the newtonian conceptual as well as mathematical framework.

Although, for some while, newtonian explanations were considered to be encompassing the entirety of observable phenomena, the experimental data forced [2] departures away from the newtonian conceptual framework. This happened, as is well known, towards the end of the 19th century. Subsequent theoretical works progressed along the following two separate directions.

Firstly, Special Relativity expanded the Galilean group to the Lorentz group of transformations (of the same coordinates used by Newton to express his Laws of Motion). This "group enlargement" provided explanations for certain physical phenomena, in particular, those from electromagnetism. These explanations were considered "natural" because Maxwell's equations, describing this radiation reasonably successfully, are form-invariant under the Lorentz group.

The same group enlargement also implies "modifications" to the Newtonian laws of motion and leads to "theoretical relations" such as the inertia-energy equivalence. These led to experimental predictions and to explanations of further physical phenomena lending credence to those theoretical relations. Einstein, specifically, attached [2] importance to the special relativistic result of the variation of inertia with velocity. That only the group enlargement leads to this result left an indelible mark on Einstein's subsequent works which led him to the Principle of General Relativity which we shall consider at a later stage.

Black body radiation, photoelectric effect, spectroscopy forced the second theoretical direction. Such physical phenomena led to mathematical techniques away from the standard newtonian and special relativistic ones. These, quantum theoretic, techniques built on the newtonian notions using Hilbert spaces, and led to specific experimental predictions. For example, Quantum Theory predicted the phenomenon of tunnelling across a barrier, and it was observed. Classical methods had no explanations for this as well as many other observed phenomena.

However, methods of neither special relativity [13] nor can quantum theory [14] claim to remove the mutual logical independencies of fundamental newtonian notions. Rather, these methods, implicitly or explicitly, replace these notions by other equivalent concepts which too are mutually logically independent. Thence, these methods are inadequate to achieve the aim of the unification of the four fundamental forces.

*Permanent Address:Central India Research Institute, Post Box 606, Laxminagar, Nagpur 440 022, India
Electronic address: cirinag_ngp@sancharnet.in
†Electronic address: waghs@ukzn.ac.za

Einstein then took the bold step of formulating judiciously constructed *Gedanken* or thought experiments and arrived at his Principle of General Relativity that the Laws of Physics should be applicable with respect to all the systems of reference, in relative acceleration or not, without extraneous or unnatural entities (like pseudo-forces) serendipitously entering into them.

Einstein's experience with the special relativistic group enlargement led him to realize that "group enlargement", further than that of the Lorentz group of Special Relativity, is demanded by this Principle of General Relativity. We then note that Laws of Physics are some mathematical statements about mathematical structures representing physical or "observable" bodies.

Clearly, there are two issues involved here: first that of deciding which mathematical structures are to represent physical bodies and, second, that of mathematical statements (equations) about these structures corresponding to physical or observable changes imagined as the transformations of these mathematical structures.

Einstein, in recognition of the above, wrote [2]:

♠ *Of which mathematical type are the variables (functions of the coordinates) which permit the expression of the physical properties of the space ("structure")? Only after that: Which equations are satisfied by those variables?* ♠

It is crucial to recognize here that the systems of reference in physics are 'constructed' out of the very physical matter or bodies which are the subject of physical laws. That is to say, a physical body gets used as a reference when physical measurements are performed. Then, the very physical phenomena that are the subject of study in Physics *affect* the physical construction of the reference systems. Hence, the validity of Einstein's principle of general relativity is incorporating, implicitly or explicitly, the physical changes that can occur to reference systems when various physical phenomena take place.

Consequently, only that mathematical framework which allows the physical systems of reference to be 'affected' by physical phenomena can be consistent with the general principle of relativity. *This situation essentially provides us a* **guiding principle** *for 'selecting' mathematical structures to represent physical bodies.*

To illustrate the use of this guiding principle, let us consider the geometry of the surface of a sphere. Mathematical coordination of the points of the spherical surface is effected by choosing the coordinate axes as the equator and a great circle passing through the north and the south poles. Further mathematical apparatus is then developed in the usual way by following the methodology of the standard differential geometry.

Physically, however, we have to consider the non-vanishing 'thickness' of the coordinate lines. Then, the physical picture has a strip of some thickness as the equatorial axis and another strip as the axis of the 'great circle'. The ' physical' coordination of the spherical surface then refers to these 'thick' coordinate axes.

Having chosen the 'physical coordination' of the spherical surface as above, we consider a small 'region' of this surface, adjacent to the coordinate strip, as a 'physical' object. Consider next that this physical object moves. The motion of physical object is then required to 'affect' and deform the chosen adjacent physical coordinate strip(s). A general mathematical description of this situation is what is then required by the physical situation under consideration.

In this situation, the principle of general relativity then 'demands' that the laws of motion of this 'physical object' be stated, and that these be the 'same' mathematical statements, in relation to 'all' the permissible such physical coordinate systems of the spherical surface.

Evidently, the mathematical formalism of the standard differential geometry does not provide us this description since, within its formalism, the coordinate axes of the geometry of surface, once chosen, do not 'deform' when we 'move' a region of surface. Hence, the standard differential geometry cannot faithfully implement Einstein's principle of general relativity [15].

Clearly, changes that occur to the "physical construction" of reference systems [2] must also be the part of any such description. Then, the equality of the description of physical phenomena must also hold incorporating any possible physical changes to the constructions of reference systems. This situation necessitates appropriate "changes" also at the conceptual levels.

That is to say, the validity of the principle of general relativity not only demands a mathematical framework that incorporates the physical construction of reference systems but also demands that we "redefine" various physical notions. I will refer to this general theoretical framework [1] as the *Universal Theory of Relativity.*

In [1], I had discussed a mathematical framework of the theories of measures and dynamical systems for this universal relativity. It could however be considered to be not sufficiently general and, hence, not entirely satisfactory. In [3], I had therefore proposed that the mathematical framework of Category Theory [4, 5] is an appropriate basis for the universal relativity and had discussed certain related mathematical issues.

For the sake of wider attention, I will recall here part of that discussion [3] about relevant mathematical notions [6, 7] and how these notions could incorporate the ideas of universal relativity. This discussion then essentially focuses on the aforementioned guiding principle. Needless to say here, much more work is still needed.

For the sake of readability, I first recall some relevant definitions and results [6, 7].

A *category*, $\mathcal{C}$, consists of *two* collections - one called the collection $\mathcal{C}_o$ of *objects* (denoted by capital letters A, B, C, ...) and the other called the collection $\mathcal{C}_A$ of *arrows* (denoted by small letters a, b, c, ...) and *four operations*. First of these operations associates with each arrow f an object of $\mathcal{C}$ called its *source or domain* (denoted by $d_o(f)$). Second operation associates with f an object of $\mathcal{C}$ called its *target or co-domain* (denoted by $d_1(f)$). We write $f : C \to D$ or $C \xrightarrow{\mathrm{f}} D$ to indicate that f is an arrow with source C and target D. Third operation associates with every object $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ an arrow, denoted by id_C and called the identity arrow of C, with source and target as C. The fourth operation associates with any pair of arrows (f, g) an arrow $f \circ g$, called the composition of f and g, such that $d_o(f) = d_1(g)$.

The above data are subject to the following four, *naturally arising*, conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} d_o(1_C) &= C = d_1(1_C) \\ d_o(f \circ g) &= d_o(g), \quad d_1(f \circ g) = d_1(f) \\ 1_D \circ f &= f, \quad f \circ id_C = f \\ (f \circ g) \circ h &= f \circ (g \circ h) \end{aligned}$$

For any two objects C and D of $\mathcal{C}$, the collection of all arrows from C to D is called the hom-set and is denoted by $Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(C, D)$. We will assume a fixed *Universe* U of sets and call members of U *small sets*. When the hom-set is a small set for any pair of objects of $\mathcal{C}$, the category is called *locally small*. We will always work with either small or locally small categories.

From $\mathcal{C}$, we form another category called the dual or the opposite category, denoted by $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$, with the same objects as in $\mathcal{C}_o$ but with directions of all arrows and the order of all compositions of arrows in $\mathcal{C}_A$ being *reversed*.

An arrow $C \xrightarrow{\mathrm{f}} D$ is called a *monic* if for any $E \in \mathcal{C}_o$ and any $g, h : E \rightrightarrows C$ in $\mathcal{C}_1$, $f \circ g = f \circ h$ implies $g = h$, and we write $f : C \rightarrowtail D$.

Two monic arrows $f : A \rightarrowtail D$ and $g : B \rightarrowtail D$ are called *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $h : A \xrightarrow{\sim} B$ such that $g \circ h = f$.

A *sub-object of* $D \in \mathcal{C}_o$ is an equivalence class of monic arrows into D. The collection $Sub_{\mathcal{C}}(D)$ of sub-objects of $D \in \mathcal{C}_o$ then comes equipped with a natural partial order: $[f] \leq [g]$ if and only if there is $h : A \to B$ with $f = g \circ h$, where the square brackets denote the equivalence class of the monic under consideration. The concept of a sub-object corresponds to that of a subset of a given set or to that of a subspace of a given space.

An *equalizer* of (parallel) arrows $f, g : A \rightrightarrows B$ is an arrow $e : E \to A$ with $f \circ e = g \circ e$ and such that given any other arrow $u : X \to A$ with $f \circ u = g \circ u$, there exists a *unique* arrow $v : X \to E$ with $e \circ v = u$. The notion of an equalizer in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$ corresponds to a *co-equalizer* in $\mathcal{C}$.

An object 0 or $0_{\mathcal{C}}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is called as the *initial* object if, for every other object D of $\mathcal{C}$ there exists one and only one arrow from 0 to D. An object 1 or $1_{\mathcal{C}}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is called as the *terminal* object if, for every other object D of $\mathcal{C}$ there exists one and only one arrow from D to 1.

An object $X \in \mathcal{C}_o$ when equipped with arrows $\pi_1 : X \to A$ and $\pi_2 : X \to B$ is called the *product of A and B* if and only if for any other $Y \in \mathcal{C}_o$ and any two arrows $f : Y \to A$ and $g : Y \to B$, there exists a *unique* arrow $h : Y \to X$ such that $\pi_1 \circ h = f$ and $\pi_2 \circ h = g$.

A product in the dual category $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$ corresponds to what is called the *co-product* in $\mathcal{C}$.

Consider objects $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ with $f : B \to A$ and $g : C \to A$. Next, consider an object $P \in \mathcal{C}_o$ with arrows $p : P \to B$ and $q : P \to C$ such that $f \circ p = g \circ q$. Such a collection of objects and arrows is called a commutative square. A commutative square is a *pullback or fibred-product* of B, C over A, written $B \times_A C$, iff, given any $X \in \mathcal{C}_o$ and arrows $\beta : X \to B$ and $\gamma : X \to C$ with $f \circ \beta = g \circ \gamma$, there is a unique arrow $\delta : X \to P$ such that $p \circ \delta = \beta$ and $q \circ \delta = \gamma$. When pullback exists, we call p as the pullback of g along f or q as the pullback of f along g.

A pullback in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$ corresponds to the notion of a *pushout* in $\mathcal{C}$.

A *functor*, F, from category $\mathcal{C}$ to category $\mathcal{D}$, is an operation which assigns to each $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ an object $F(C) \in \mathcal{D}_o$, and to each $f \in \mathcal{C}_A$ an arrow $F(f) \in \mathcal{D}_A$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(d_o(f)) &= d_o(F(f)) \\ F(d_1(f)) &= d_1(F(f)) \\ F(1_C) &= 1_{F(C)} \\ F(f \circ g) &= F(f) \circ F(g) \end{aligned}$$

whenever $f \circ g$ is defined.

For categories $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, a functor $F : \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathcal{D}$ is called as *contra-variant* from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{D}$. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is called *full (faithful)* if for any $C, C' \in \mathcal{C}_o$, the operation $Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(C', C) \to Hom_{\mathcal{D}}(FC', FC)$, $f \mapsto F(f)$, is *surjective (injective)*.

The operation $C' \mapsto Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(C', C)$ for fixed C yields a contra-variant functor, called Hom-functor, from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathbb{S}ets$, where $\mathbb{S}ets$ is the category of sets. Also, $C \mapsto Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(C', C)$ for fixed C' provides a covariant Hom-functor. Functors that are isomorphic to the Hom-functor are said to be *representable functors*.

Given functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightrightarrows \mathcal{D}$, a *natural transformation* $\alpha : F \to G$ is an assignment of each object $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ to an arrow $\alpha_C : FC \to GC$ in $\mathcal{D}_1$, called component of α at C, such that, for any $f : C' \to C$ in $\mathcal{C}_1$, $G(f) \circ \alpha_{C'} = \alpha_C \circ F(f)$.

If $\alpha : F \to G$ and $\beta : G \to H$ are two natural transformations between functors from category $\mathcal{C}$ to category $\mathcal{D}$, a composite natural transformation, denoted $\beta \circ \alpha$, is then naturally definable by setting $(\beta \circ \alpha)_C = \beta_{G(C)} \circ \alpha_C$.

For fixed categories $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$, we can then construct a *functor category*, denoted by $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$, with its objects as functors from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{D}$ and its arrows as natural transformations of these functors.

Given two functors in opposite directions, that is, $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ and $G : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{C}$, we say that F is *left adjoint* to G, or, equivalently, G is *right adjoint* to F, written $F \dashv G$, when for any $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_o$, there exists a bijective correspondence $\theta : Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(C, GD) \xrightarrow{\sim} Hom_{\mathcal{D}}(FC, D)$ with the arrow $f : C \to GD$ uniquely determining the arrow $h : FC \to D$ and conversely.

With the *adjunction* as above, the unique arrow $\eta_C : C \to GFC$ with $\theta(\eta_C) = 1_{F(C)}$ is called the *unit of adjunction at* C. The dual notion is that of the *co-unit of adjunction* which also is a unique arrow $\varepsilon_D : FGD \to C$.

When product $A \times B$ of any pair of objects $A, B \in \mathcal{C}_o$ exists, it provides the product functor $\times : \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{2}} \to \mathcal{C}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ is the 2-object category, with only identity arrows of those objects. The product functor is right adjoint to the *diagonal functor* $\triangle : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{2}}$ sending $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ to $C \times C$.

Let products exist in $\mathcal{C}$. Fix an object $A \in \mathcal{C}_o$ and consider a functor $A \times - : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$. If a right adjoint to this functor exists, we denote it by $(-)^A : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ and say that the object A is an *exponentiable object of* $\mathcal{C}$.

A category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *cartesian closed* if it has a terminal object, binary products and if all objects of $\mathcal{C}$ are exponentiable. For any small category $\mathcal{C}$, the functor category $\widehat{C} = \mathbb{S}ets^{\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}}$ is a cartesian closed category.

Consider the functor category $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}}$ with a fixed category $\mathcal{C}$ and a small category $\mathbb{J}$. An object of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}}$ is called a *diagram of type* $\mathbb{J}$ *in* $\mathcal{C}$. Each object $C \in \mathcal{C}_o$ determines a *constant diagram* $\triangle_{\mathbb{J}}(C)$ having the same value C for all $j \in \mathbb{J}$. This provides a diagonal functor $\triangle_{\mathbb{J}} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}}$.

A natural transformation π from $\triangle_{\mathbb{J}}(C)$ to another diagram A of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}}$ therefore consists of arrows $f_j : C \to A_j$, for each 'index' $j \in \mathbb{J}$, all such that $f_j : C \to A(j), f_k : C \to A(k), A(u) : A(j) \to A(k)$ with $u : j \to k$ form a commutative triangle for every arrow $u \in \mathbb{J}_1$. We call π a *cone* $f : C \to A$ *on the diagram* A *with vertex* C.

A cone $\pi : L \to A$ with vertex L is *universal* when to every other cone $f : C \to A$ corresponds a unique arrow $g : C \to L$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\pi_j \circ g = f_j$ for every $j \in \mathbb{J}_o$. We call this universal cone $\pi : L \to A$ as the *limit of the diagram* A.

If every diagram in the functor category $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}}$ has a limit in this sense then, the diagonal functor $\triangle_{\mathbb{J}}$ has a right adjoint - $\lim_{\leftarrow \mathbb{J}} : \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}} \to \mathcal{C}$ - and the co-unit of this adjunction is the universal cone, which is a natural transformation - $\pi : \triangle_{\mathbb{J}}(L) = \triangle_{\mathbb{J}}(\lim_{\leftarrow \mathbb{J}} A) \to A$.

The notion dual to limit is that of the *co-limit*. If the co-limit of any diagram of type $\mathbb{J}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ exists then, it provides a functor $\lim_{\rightarrow \mathbb{J}} : \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}} \to \mathcal{C}$ which is left-adjoint to $\triangle_{\mathbb{J}} : \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{J}} \to \mathcal{C}$.

If $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{D}$ are categories and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{D}}$ is the functor category, with diagrams of type $\mathbb{J}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ existing in $\mathcal{C}$ ($\mathbb{J}$ being a small category), then the same holds also for $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{D}}$, and the *evaluation functor* $(-)_D : \mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{D}} \to \mathcal{C}$, for any $D \in \mathcal{D}_o$, preserves such limits.

Consequently, for each $D \in \mathcal{D}$, $(\lim_{\leftarrow \mathbb{J}} A)(D) \cong \lim_{\leftarrow \mathbb{J}} A_D$ where the limit on the left is in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{D}}$ and that on the right is in $\mathcal{C}$. Similarly, for the co-limits, $(\lim_{\rightarrow \mathbb{J}} A)(D) \cong \lim_{\rightarrow \mathbb{J}} A_D$.

Now, a *sub-object classifier* is a monic arrow $\mathbf{true} : 1_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrowtail \Omega$, where $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_o$, such that for every monic $g : S \rightarrowtail X$ in $\mathcal{C}_1$, with $S, X \in \mathcal{C}_o$, there exists a unique arrow $\phi : X \to \Omega$, making a pullback diagram of $f : S \to 1_{\mathcal{C}}$, g, ϕ and $\mathbf{true}$. This evidently requires the category $\mathcal{C}$ to have finite limits, *ie*, to admit a terminal object $1_{\mathcal{C}}$. This generalizes the set-theoretic notion of the characteristic function of the subset of a set.

Then, in a category $\mathcal{C}$ with finite limits, every sub-object is uniquely a pullback of the "universal" monic $\mathbf{true} : 1_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrowtail \Omega$. The sub-object functor is then isomorphic to a Hom-functor, *ie*, $Sub_{\mathcal{C}}(X) \cong Hom_{\mathcal{C}}(X, \Omega)$. That is to say, a sub-object functor is representable when the underlying category $\mathcal{C}$ admits finite limits. A category is said to be *well-powered* when $Sub_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$ is isomorphic to a small set for all $X \in \mathcal{C}_o$.

A category $\mathcal{E}$ with (i) all finite limits and co-limits, (ii) all objects in $\mathcal{E}_o$ being exponentiable, and (iii) a sub-object classifier $\mathbf{true} : 1_{\mathcal{E}} \to \Omega$, is called an *elementary topos* or, simply, a *topos*. A topos is, then, a complete cartesian closed category equipped with a sub-object classifier. Examples of toposes include $\mathbb{S}ets$, the functor category $\mathbb{S}ets^{\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}}$ for a small category $\mathcal{C}$, etc.

At this point, we note that the *Intuitionistic Propositional Calculus* [16], as formalized by Heyting, has a typical model in the form of the *set of all open subsets of a topological space*. In this model, the operations $\wedge$ and $\vee$ of the propositional calculus correspond to intersection and union, but the operations $\Rightarrow$ and $\neg$ have to be suitably reinterpreted in order to yield open sets. Then, $U \Rightarrow V$ is the largest open set W with $W \wedge U \subset V$, and $\neg U$ is the interior of the complement of U - the largest open set disjoint from U.

Model independent characterization of this intuitionistic propositional calculus is provided by the notion of a distributive lattice as follows.

Any *partially ordered set* (poset) $(P, \leq)$ gives rise to a category for which the elements of P are objects and there exists one and only one arrow from p to q iff $p \leq q$. Identity arrows are forced by reflexivity and the composition of arrows is forced by the transitivity of the partial order.

A *lattice* is a poset having, as a category, all binary products and all binary co-products.

A poset P is *complete* iff every subset of P has a lowest upper bound (lub or sup or join) and a greatest lower bound (glb or inf or meet). A poset P is then complete iff, as a category, P has all limits and all co-limits.

A *complete lattice* L with elements 0 and 1 with $0 \leq x \leq 1$ for all $x \in L$ is a complete poset.

A lattice L with 0 and 1 is then equationally expressible as a set with two 'distinguished' elements 0, 1 and two, associative & commutative, binary operations $\wedge$ (meet) and $\vee$ (join) satisfying:

$$\begin{array}{ll} x \wedge x = x, & x \vee x = x \\ 1 \wedge x = x, & 0 \vee x = x \\ x \wedge (y \vee x) = x, & (x \wedge y) \vee x = x \end{array}$$

We may then define a 'lattice object' L in a category $\mathcal{C}$ with finite products as the partial order of the lattice is recoverable from the above equations on the operations $\wedge : L \times L \to L$, $\vee : L \times L \to L$ and $0, 1 : 1_{\mathcal{C}} \to L$.

A lattice L is said to be *distributive* iff, for all $x, y, z \in L$,

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$$

A *complement* of $x \in L$ with 0 and 1 is then an element $a \in L$ such that $x \wedge a = 0$ and $x \vee a = 1$. In a distributive lattice, a complement, *if it exists*, is necessarily unique.

A Boolean algebra B is a distributive lattice with 0 and 1 in which every element x has a complement. In B, $\neg x$ is then interpreted as a complement. M H Stone's theorem asserts that every boolean algebra is isomorphic to an algebra of some of the subsets of some set.

A Heyting algebra H or the Brouwerian Lattice is a poset with all finite products, all finite co-products and is cartesian closed as a category. Underlying lattice of any Heyting algebra can be shown to be distributive.

An exponential y^x, $x, y \in H$, is usually written as $x \Rightarrow y$ and is characterized by its adjunction: $z \leq (x \Rightarrow y)$ if and only if $z \wedge x \leq y$.

In a Heyting algebra, we define the negation of x as $\neg x = (x \Rightarrow 0)$. Then, $\neg x$, is not necessarily a complement of x, since $x \wedge \neg x = 0$ but, not always, $x \vee \neg x = 1$. However, if a complement of $x \in H$ exists, then it must equal $\neg x$. Also, $\neg\neg x$ need not equal x in any Heyting algebra.

Moreover, the following also hold in any Heyting algebra:

$$\begin{gathered} x \leq \neg\neg x, \\ x \leq y \text{ implies } \neg y \leq \neg x \\ \neg x = \neg\neg\neg x \\ \neg\neg(x \wedge y) = \neg\neg x \wedge \neg\neg y \end{gathered}$$

The 'negation' is then a functor $\neg : H \to H^{\mathrm{op}}$ and also $\neg : H^{\mathrm{op}} \to H$ which is adjoint to itself. A Heyting algebra is then a Boolean algebra iff this adjunction is an isomorphism. That is, a Heyting algebra is Boolean iff $\neg\neg x = x$ for all $x \in H$ or, iff $x \vee \neg x = 1$ for all $x \in H$. Then, quantifiers of predicate calculus like $(\forall)$ and $(\exists)$ are also adjunctions in a Heyting algebra setting.

In any lattice L with 0 and 1, a binary operation $\Rightarrow$ satisfying, for all $x, y, z \in L$,

$$\begin{gathered} (x \Rightarrow x) = 1 \\ x \wedge (x \Rightarrow y) = x \wedge y, \qquad y \wedge (x \Rightarrow y) = y \\ x \Rightarrow (y \vee z) = (x \Rightarrow y) \vee (x \Rightarrow z) \end{gathered}$$

must be the 'implication' of a Heyting algebra structure on the lattice L.

In a functor category $\widehat{C} = \mathbb{S}ets^{\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}}$ with a small category $\mathcal{C}$, for the object P of $\widehat{C}_o$, the partially ordered set $Sub_{\widehat{C}}(P)$ of sub-objects of P is, in particular, a Heyting algebra (and sometimes, a special case, Boolean algebra).

A *Frame* is then a complete lattice L in which binary meet distributes over arbitrary joins, *ie*,

$$x \wedge \bigvee S = \bigvee \{x \wedge y | y \in S\}$$

for all $x \in L$ and $S \subseteq L$.

A *Frame homomorphism* is a map $h : L \to M$ between *Frames* L and M preserving finite meets (including the top $\mathtt{1}$) and arbitrary joins (including the bottom 0).

Any $a \in L$ gives rise to two new *Frames* called as the *open quotient*, $\downarrow a = \{x \in L | x \leq a\}$, and the *closed quotient*, $\uparrow a = \{x \in L | x \geq a\}$, determined by $a \in L$ with homomorphisms $L \to \downarrow a : x \mapsto x \wedge a$ and $L \to \uparrow a : x \mapsto x \vee a$.

A particular *Frame*, a complete distributive lattice with 0 and 1, is then a Heyting algebra always. Also, for any topological space X, the lattice of its open sets, $\mathcal{O}X$, forms a *Frame*, being partially ordered by set inclusion.

The correspondence $X \to \mathcal{O}X$ is functorial with the functor $\mathcal{O} : \mathbb{T}op \to \mathbb{F}rm$ being a contravariant functor, with $\mathbb{T}op$ as the category of topological spaces and $\mathbb{F}rm$ being the category of *Frames*. Any continuous map $f : X \to Y$ determines a *Frame homomorphism* $\mathcal{O}f : \mathcal{O}Y \to \mathcal{O}X$ with $\mathcal{O}f(U) = f^{-1}(U)$ for all $U \in \mathcal{O}Y$.

The *Spectrum functor* in the opposite direction $\Sigma : \mathbb{F}rm \to \mathbb{T}op$ assigns to each *Frame* L its *spectrum* ΣL that is the space of all homomorphisms $\xi : L \to \mathbf{2}$, $\mathbf{2}$ being the 2-element lattice. Each homomorphism ξ is called as a *point of* L, and provides open sets $\Sigma_a = \{\xi \in \Sigma L | \xi a = 1\}$ for any $a \in L$. It also assigns to each of the *Frame homomorphisms* $h : M \to L$ a continuous map $\Sigma h : \Sigma L \to \Sigma M$ such that $\Sigma h(\xi) = \xi h$ with $(\Sigma h)^{-1}(\Sigma_a) = \Sigma_{h(a)}$ for any $a \in M$.

The two functors $\mathcal{O}$ and Σ are adjoint on the right with the unit of this adjunction being denoted by η_L and the co-unit by ε_X.

Frames for which η_L is an isomorphism are called *spatial*. $\mathcal{O}X$ is a *spatial Frame*.

Spaces for which ε_X is a homomorphism are called the *Sober Spaces*. Category of Sober spaces $\mathbb{S}ob$ is dually equivalent to the full subcategory of $\mathbb{S}p\mathbb{F}rm$ of *spatial Frames*.

Category opposite to $\mathbb{F}rm$ is called as the category $\mathbb{L}oc$ of *locales* and it contains $\mathbb{S}ob$ as a full subcategory. Category $\mathbb{L}oc$ is often used in the relevant mathematical literature on pointless topology which provides a wider basis than the usual topological structure.

A *Frame of reals*, denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$, is a frame generated by all ordered pairs (p, q), $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$, subject to the following relations:

$(p, q) \wedge (r, s) = (p \wedge r, q \wedge s)$
$(p, q) \vee (r, s) = (p, s)$ whenever $p \leq r < q \leq s$
$(p, q) = \bigvee \{(r, s) | p < r < s < q\}$
$\mathtt{1} = \bigvee \{(p, q) | p, q \in \mathbb{Q}\}$

where $\mathtt{1}$ denotes the top of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ denotes the set of rational numbers.

The *real numbers* are then the *Frame* homomorphisms $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbf{2}$, that is to say, the points of the frame $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$ or the spectrum $\Sigma(\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}))$.

A *continuous real-valued function* on an arbitrary *Frame* L is then defined as a *Frame* homomorphism $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}) \to L$. Continuous functions on L are then L-valued real numbers.

In the setting of pointless topology, the algebra $\mathbf{R}(L)$ of continuous real-valued functions on *Frame* L is then definable using *Frame* homomorphisms $\alpha, \beta, ...$ from $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}) \to L$, with operations of this algebra being determined by the operations of $\mathbb{Q}$ as a lattice-ordered ring.

Next, a sheaf F of sets on a topological space X is a contravariant functor $F : \mathcal{O}(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{S}ets$ such that each open covering $U = \bigcup_i, i \in I$, of an open set U of X yields an equalizer diagram:

$$FU \xrightarrow{\mathrm{e}} \prod_i FU_i \underset{\mathrm{q}}{\overset{\mathrm{p}}{\rightrightarrows}} \prod_{i,j} F\left(U_i \bigcap U_j\right)$$

where for $t \in FU$, $e(t) = \{t|_{U_i} | i \in I\}$ and for a family $t_i \in FU_i$, $p(t_i) = \{t_i|_{(U_i \bigcap U_j)}\}$, $q(t_i) = \{t_i|_{(U_i \bigcap U_j)}\}$. Here $\mathcal{O}(X)$ denotes the category of all open subsets of X, arrows of $\mathcal{O}(X)$ being provided by set inclusions. Then, an arrow $F \to G$ of sheaves is a natural transformation of functors. By its definition, the category, $\mathbb{S}h(X)$, of sheaves over a topological space X is then a full sub-category of the functor category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}(X)} = \mathbb{S}ets^{\mathcal{O}(X)^{\mathrm{op}}}$. The category $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ of sheaves over the space X is, in particular, a topos.

Thus, a *sheaf* is [7] a "continuous set-valued" function. A sub-sheaf of a sheaf F over a space X is a sub-functor of F which is itself a sheaf. Categorical co-limits of finite limits in $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ provide *geometric constructions*. These are point-wise and provide sheaves. Category $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ of sheaves over X then contains an object - called the *generic set* - from which every other object of $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ can be geometrically constructed [7].

Thus, when X is a topological space, sub-sheaves of the terminal object of $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ provide the *open* subsets of X. When X are Sober spaces, continuous maps between them are functors between the corresponding categories of sheaves preserving the geometric constructions.

Assigning, in particular, to $a \in L$ the set of all continuous real-valued functions on $\downarrow a$ defines a sheaf on *Frame* L. This sheaf is then a *real number object* in the topos of sheaves on L. [Note however that this construction does *not* extend to the category $\mathbf{F}rm$ of *Frames*.]

In general, the object $\mathbf{R}_X$ of Dedekind reals in the topos $\mathbb{S}h(X)$, where X is a topological space, is isomorphic to the sheaf of continuous real-valued functions on X defined on the open sets U of X by $\mathbf{R}_X(U) \cong \{f : U \to \mathbb{R} | f \,\text{is continuous}\}$.

$\mathbb{S}h(X)$ then provides [7, 8] a generalization of a topological space - the *generalized space of sets* - because the generic set is, in general, *not* isomorphic to the initial object of $\mathbb{S}h(X)$, and the sub-objects of the terminal object of $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ not necessarily its elements. Consequently, the notion, for example, of "continuity" acquires a new meaning in terms of the generic set.

Topos Theory was then developed [7, 9, 10, 11] using a complete cartesian closed category with a sub-object classifier - a Topos - as its fundamental structure which is free of all set theoretic assumptions. This, Lawvere and Tierney, axiomatization is elementary in the sense of the first order logic with no reference to set theory.

Based on topos theoretic ideas, the differential structure built by giving up the Law of Excluded Middle in the Euclidean setup leads to Synthetic Differential Geometry [8].

Using a topos equipped with the notion of an infinitesimal time-interval, it is then possible [9, 10, 11] to recast the newtonian framework into the topos theoretic language. In [12], equations of physics, such as a wave equation and a heat equation, are also discussed from this point of view.

Physically, the construction of a reference system must use physical bodies. [Recall, from our earlier example, the 'thick' coordinate lines of the surface of sphere.] For its mathematical expression, we *may* consider a physical body as a collection of open subsets of some topological space X [17]. A physical reference system may therefore be mathematically representable as a *Frame*, a spatial *Frame*. Our "guiding principle" then leads us, thus far, to this identification.

Generalizing on the above, the category $\mathbb{F}rm$ of *Frames* or, equivalently, the category $\mathbb{L}oc$ of locales could then form the underlying mathematical basis for Universal Relativity. The category $\mathbb{S}h(X)$ would also be equally relevant. In this framework, *Frame homomorphisms* could then represent the occurrence of physical phenomena affecting the reference systems.

Issues regarding the physical characteristics of material bodies will then involve suitable *measures over Frames*. Corresponding mathematical questions have not been addressed as yet.

Furthermore, the category $\mathbb{F}rm$ is not a Topos. (There exist many other categories which are not toposes.) Consequently, it is unclear whether the Topos Theory could form a mathematical basis for the universal relativity as it did [9] for the newtonian theoretical framework.

It may also be noted here that the work in [12] assumes, in a topos setting, a cartesian closed category with a commutative ring object for formulating the 'wave equation' as an ordinary differential equation with values in the vector space (meaning R-module) of distributions.

But, the category $\mathbb{F}rm$ is not a topos. It is therefore equally unclear whether the description in [12] is any sufficiently general one.

[However, a detailed investigation of this and other issues involved herein will surely be important to the understanding of various implications of the universal theory of relativity.

In any case, the newtonian mathematical framework is required to be a part of that for the universal theory of relativity. Consequently, the mathematical framework of universal relativity will have to 'incorporate' this topos theoretic treatment of newtonian theories.]

Still, the notion of a category is general indeed and, hence, could itself form the basis for universal relativity. To apply categorical notions to physical situations in universal relativity, we then need to associate, in some manner, an appropriate mathematical notion for 'physical characteristics of material bodies' to objects, or, equivalently, to arrows of the category.

An important unanswered mathematical issue is then of defining an appropriate notion of measures (or a generalization thereof) within the basic setting of the category theory.

Notably, very general ideas from Physics and Mathematics, both, appear to become quite identical here. Starting with the limited formalism in [1], this "realization" is certainly a significant progress. Much more work is clearly required before the theoretical framework of the universal theory of relativity can be mathematically represented in a satisfactory manner.

I hope to have clarified here physical principles behind the universal theory of relativity in sufficient details and to also have conveyed to the reader its mathematical requirements.

Acknowledgments

Firstly, extensive discussions with Partha Ghosh as well as with Gareth Amery, Sunil Maharaj and many others are gratefully acknowledged. I thank the organizers of the South African Mathematical Society's 48th Meeting for very good conference arrangements and for an opportunity to present this work. I am grateful to the School of Mathematical Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal for extending to me all the support. I am also grateful to Maga Moodley, K Komathiraj and Partha Ghosh for giving me the enjoyable company during the beautiful drive around the impressive Drakensburg mountain to Grahamstown and back to the ever-enjoyable city of Durban.

[1] Wagh S M (2005) *Foundations of a Universal Theory of Relativity*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0505063
———— (2005) *Towards a Universal Theory of Relativity*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0504036
———— (2005) *Special Relativity as a Physical Theory*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0410124
———— (2005) *The Significance of the General Principle of Relativity*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0502088
———— (2004) *On the continuum origin of Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0404066
———— (2004) *Heuristic approach to a natural unification of the Quantum Theory and the General Theory of Relativity*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0409057
———— (2004) *Einsteinian field theory as a program in fundamental physics*,
http://arxiv.org/physics/0404028
———— (2004) *Some fundamental issues in General Relativity and their resolution*,
http://arxiv.org/gr-qc/0402003

[2] Einstein A (1970) in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist* (Ed. P A Schlipp, Open Court Publishing Company - The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol VII, La Salle)
See also, Einstein A (1968) *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* (Methuen & Co. Ltd, London) (See, in particular, Appendix V: Relativity and the Problem of Space.)
See also, Pais A (1982) *Subtle is the Lord ... The science and the life of Albert Einstein* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)

[3] Wagh S M (2005) *Progress with a Universal Theory of Relativity*, presented at the South African Relativity Society's Einstein Centennial Meeting, Durban, September 25-26, 2005.
http://arxiv.org/physics/0602032

[4] Lawvere F W (1966) *The category of categories as a foundation for mathematics*, (La Jolla Conference on Categorical Algebra, Springer-Verlag) pp. 1 - 20 and references therein

[5] Maclane S (1971) *Categories for the Working Mathematicians*, (Springer-Verlag, New York) and references therein

[6] Banaschewski B (1997) *The Real Numbers in Pointfree Topology*, (Textos de Matemática, Série B, Departamento de Matemática, da Universidade de Coimbra) and references therein

[7] Maclane S and Moerdijk I (1992) *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic - A First Introduction to Topos Theory*, (Springer-Verlag, New York) and references therein

[8] Kock A (1981) *Synthetic Differential Geometry*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) and references therein

[9] Lawvere F W (2002) *Categorical algebra for Continnum Micro-physics*, *Jr. Pure Appl. Alg.*, Vol. 175, pp. 267-287

[10] Lawvere F W (1997) *Toposes of Laws of Motion*, (American Mathematical Society, Transcript from video, Montreal - September 27, 1997)

[11] Lawvere F W (1980) *Towards the description in a smooth topos of the dynamically possible motions and deformations of a continuous body*, Cahiers de Top. et. Geom. Diff, **XXI**, No. 4, pp. 377 - 392

[12] Kock A and Reyes G E (2003) *Some calculus with extensive quantities: Wave equation*, *Theory and Applications of Categories*, Vol 11, No 14, pp. 321 - 336 and references therein

[13] Special relativity and Newton's theory, both, remain silent on as to how to treat the physical laws in relation to systems of reference in acceleration relative to inertial systems. It therefore needs to postulate pseudo-forces in laws stated relative to non-inertial systems. There are no 'sources' in material bodies for the pseudo-forces and, hence, these represent 'unnatural' or 'extraneous' quantities that we have to postulate [1].

[14] Quantum theory replaces the notion of force by the corresponding potential and uses mathematical techniques (involving Hilbert spaces) different than the standard newtonian ones. Nonetheless, quantum theory is based on inertia, potential, source of the potential and a law of potential as mutually logically independent concepts. Methods of quantum theory cannot then lead to 'unification' of the four fundamental physical interactions in the sense as described in the sequel.

[15] As the standard differential geometry does not do justice to Einstein's principle of general relativity, its use through Einstein's equations is inappropriate for physical problems [1, 3]. Einstein had, in fact, abandoned [2] the formulation which he himself had proposed and had dubbed the field equations proposed by him as "preliminary equations' of an attempt to test the usefulness of the ideas of general relativity.

[16] Intuitionistic Logic originated with Brouwer who insisted that any proof by contradiction be not allowed, *ie*, all proofs be *constructive*. In this approach, *all* functions $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are *continuous* for an appropriate description of real numbers $\mathbb{R}$. Axiomatic foundation for Brouwer's ideas was provided by Heyting and others.

[17] Objection that the coordinate axes (intervals) be closed, compact and bounded, since such is the case with the real line $\mathbb{R}$, does not apply here because physically interesting quantity is only the measurable or observable "distance" between bodies and is definable for *Frames* as "distance between sets". I thank Prof B Banaschewski for raising this issue during a short discussion.